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Resolutions

Resolution: Meeting minutes of TC F2F meeting of 13th October 2008 accepted.
Resolution: Issue 49 is closed with no action

Actions
None

Agenda
1. Roll call
2. Confirm minute taker, Mike Edwards
3. Agenda bashing
4. Meeting Minutes
   Vote to accept minutes from Oct 13, 2008 meeting
5. TC Logistics:
   a. Recording issue status - 10 Open
6. ACTION ITEMS
   a. Dave Booz to provide proposal for issue 33
   b. 20081002-01: (Mike E) Inform the Assembly TC of removal of element.
   c. 20081002-02: (Rich L and Ashok) - Prepare a detailed proposal for a resolution of issue 57 (Target Nov 10)
   d. 20081002-04: (Ashok) To prepare a full proposal for Issue 32 for an intent which conveys the need for mutual authentication (Target Nov 10)
   e. 20081002-05: (Dave B) Prepare the proposal that will resolve Issue 54
DONE
f. 20081002-06: (Ashok) to prepare the specification wording for Issue 46 resolution, plus an updated XSD (Target Nov 10)

7. New Issues
   a. none

8. Issue Discussion
   a. ISSUE 49: Handling of Implementation Intents in the Implementation Hierarchy is not described
      http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-49
      Original Proposal:

   b. ISSUE 59: Limit policySet attachment to bindings
      http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-59
      Discussion:
      Original Proposal:

   c. ISSUE-60: Clarify scope of ordered intent
      http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-60
      Proposal:

   d. ISSUE-61: How are mayProvides intents on bindings satisfied
      http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-61
      Proposal:

   e. ISSUE-54: Wire validation rules have changed
      http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-54
      Proposal:
f. ISSUE 57: Fine grain authorization intent
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-57

Original Proposal:

g. ISSUE-35: Define Conformance Target
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-35

h. ISSUE-48: Transaction defaults are not optimal
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-48

i. ISSUE-33: Capabilities
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-33
proposal:

j. ISSUE-32: Security intent which allows a client to authenticate a server
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-32
proposal:

k. ISSUE-44: Need a clear way to distinguish Implementation Intents from Interaction Intents
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-44
proposal: waiting to see if we need it

9. AOB
a. straggler roll

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing
No changes

(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC
Vote to accept minutes from Oct 13th, 2008 meeting

Resolution: Meeting minutes of TC F2F meeting of 13th October 2008 accepted.
(Item 5) TC Logistics
a. Recording issue status - 10 Open

(Item 6) Action Items
a. Dave Booz to provide proposal for issue 33
   Outstanding
b. 20081002-01: (Mike E) Inform the Assembly TC of removal of <operation/> element.
   Outstanding
c. 20081002-02: (Rich L and Ashok) - Prepare a detailed proposal for a resolution of issue 57 (Target Nov 10)
   Outstanding
d. 20081002-04: (Ashok) To prepare a full proposal for Issue 32 for an intent which conveys the need for mutual authentication (Target Nov 10)
   Outstanding
e. 20081002-05: (Dave B) Prepare the proposal that will resolve Issue 54
   DONE
f. 20081002-06: (Ashok) to prepare the specification wording for Issue 46 resolution, plus an updated XSD (Target Nov 10)
   Outstanding

(Item 7) New Issues
None

(Item 8) Existing Issues
ISSUE 49: Handling of Implementation Intents in the Implementation
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-49

Original Proposal:

Sanjay describes original proposal
Anish: what defines an intent as an implementation/interaction intent. Is it the @constrains attribute on <intent> element?

Dave Booz: that's the closest we have...there is an issue open to add something concrete to an intent definition...at the F2F we informally agreed to leave that issue until we find a requirement for such a concrete marking.

Anish: sanjay's proposal would, it seems to me, require such a marking
Dave Booz: yes

Mike E raises the point about the ability to mark a <composite/> element with an implementation intent which then flows down.
Sanjay thinks that it is very different in that the composite builder has all of the lower level components in view at the time they mark the `<composite/>` element.

Discussion of the meaning of the implementationType structure which lists intents.

Discussion of what is known about a runtime container at design time.

Mike E - SCA is deliberately loose about what the capabilities of an actual runtime container are - unlike JEE for example.

Anish - I'm trying to understand the different scenarios.

Sanjay: I would be fine with removing the capability to attach implementation intents at the `<composite/>` element level.

Sanjay: Need a way for the designer to be able to resolve conflict where some runtime is not capable of honouring a given implementation intent.

Anish: are we arguing about what essentially boils down to syntactic sugars, or am I not getting it?

Dave: I see the design time problem (capabilities) that we're getting into is covered under Issue 33. But I don't get why there is this need to drill down into a composite.

Dave draws a distinction between a component that can declare that it cannot do certain things (marked via intents) versus the ability of a runtime to declare that it cannot handle components marked in some specific ways.

Anish: I'm a little confused about how all these issues: declaring intents that are not supported, design-time v. runtime error generation; are related to whether a non-atomic component inherits implementation intents. These issues are important, but I don't understand how they affect the issue at hand.

Sanjay - Would like a standard way to detect no later than deployment time that the runtime cannot deal with the requirements of the application.

Anish - I'm not sure how these issues are related. All good questions, but we allow intents to be declared on a component - and all these problems occur when you use intents in that way - what difference does it make if the intents are inherited?

Sanjay - the core of this issue is that we dont have a way to detect before execution that there is a problem (can't run the implementation).

Dave B: Discusses the meaning of Issue 33 further.
Sanjay - Detection of conflicts before the runtime is one requirement. Also, external attachment of intents would allow specific attachment of policy as required.

Dave Booz: Issue 15 definitely doesn't allow for external attachment of intents - but nor does the resolution seem to disallow it, so this could be opened as a new issue

Anish: if external attachments are about deployment, why would you attach intents as opposed to policysets?
Mike E: I agree Anish - that's why we left intents out of the resolution of #15

Sanjay moves to close Issue 49 with no action
Plamen seconds

**Resolution:** Issue 49 is closed with no action

Close of business

**Issue Status Reporting - for Liaison Committee**

9 open issues
0 opened today
1 closed today

**AOB**

Next meeting 27th Oct
Close of Business